Inside this issue:

- **Trump's Nomination of Kevin Warsh to Fed Chair**
- **America's Pivot to Sovereignty-first Diplomacy**
- **U.S. Exits the Paris Climate Accord During a Cold Snap**
- **DOJ Opens Investigation Into the Fed**
- **Texas and Florida Crack Down on H-1B Use at State Agencies**
- **Military Purges in China Reveal Deeper Possible Intrigue**
- **State Department Defunds Foreign Groups That Promote DEI, Transgenderism**
- **The Unwinding Yen Carry Trade: How Cheap Japanese Borrowing Fueled Global Markets — and Now Threatens to Destabilize Them**
- **Glacier National Park's "Gone by the Year 2020" Signs Now Forgotten**
- **HUD Citizenship Verification Ends Taxpayer Giveaway to Illegals**
- **Government Giveth Cheap Gas, but Taketh Away Freedom: the Kill Switch Irony**
- **NYMHM: News You May Have Missed**

Trump's Nomination of Kevin Warsh to Fed Chair

President Donald Trump has nominated Kevin Warsh as the next chair of the Federal Reserve, succeeding Jerome Powell, whose term expires in May. This news cites Warsh's controversial ties to globalist circles, including his role as a former steering committee member of the Bilderberg Group and his marriage to the daughter of controversial billionaire Ronald Lauder.

Warsh, 55, is no stranger to the Fed. Appointed as a governor by President George W. Bush in 2006, he served until 2011, earning a reputation as a monetary policy hawk who advocated for tighter controls to combat inflation. During the 2008 financial crisis, Warsh was instrumental in crisis management, but post-crisis, he criticized the Fed's aggressive quantitative easing, arguing it distorted markets and fueled asset bubbles. Critics within conservative circles, however, question his independence, pointing to his involvement with the Bilderberg Group — a secretive annual gathering of global elites who attempt to undermine national sovereignty. His family connections to Lauder, a prominent figure in international finance, further fuel concerns about potential conflicts of interest in steering U.S. monetary policy.

Market reactions were swift and telling. Upon the news breaking, the U.S. dollar strengthened against major currencies, while Treasury yields climbed, reflecting expectations of a less accommodative Fed under Warsh. Gold prices tumbled more than five percent, silver followed suit, and Bitcoin dipped three percent, as investors braced for higher interest rates. Stock futures wobbled, with analysts noting that Warsh's hawkish stance could clash with Trump's pro-growth agenda, which has often called for lower rates to boost the economy. Ironically, Trump has repeatedly lambasted Powell for not cutting rates aggressively enough, yet Warsh's history suggests he might prioritize inflation control over stimulus — a potential point of friction.

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez
William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2026 by *The New American*

Another source of possible friction might arise from his misalignment with MAGA values over the subject of immigration. The last Bilderberg meeting, held June 12-15, 2025 in Stockholm, Sweden, had as one of its agenda items "Depopulation and Migration" — the first time that topic had ever been openly discussed in the powerful forum.

If Kevin Warsh, who attended the meeting, ascends to Fed chair, he could subtly shape his monetary policies to abet more mass migration. Declining birth rates and aging populations — key demographic concerns — threaten labor shortages and slower GDP expansion. Evidence suggests that Warsh is poised to back policies to accommodate unrestricted migration, viewing it as a tool to replenish workforces and sustain growth without the strategic use of inflation by the government.

This nomination opens up broader debates about the Federal Reserve's purpose, as it's caught between the countervailing pressures of globalism and economic nationalism. Supporters argue Warsh's experience would be sold to the public as restoring fiscal discipline. Detractors warn of deeper entanglements with globalist institutions that prioritize international agendas over American interests. If confirmed by the Senate, Warsh's tenure could mark a pivotal shift. Will Trump's choice align with "America First" principles, or does it signal a counter-revolution as the "Empire strikes back"? The nomination underscores the enduring tension between economic sovereignty and global influences in U.S. policymaking. — Rebecca Terrell

America's Pivot to Sovereignty-first Diplomacy

Happily, there is a growing distrust of international organizations such as the World Economic Forum (WEF). Not only are individuals becoming skeptical of their disconnected top-down approach, but nation-states are showing signs of deepening distrust as well. As outlined in a recent *Modern Diplomacy* article, the United States is pivoting away from passive obedience to these internationalist organizations in favor of a more America First approach. What the shift will ultimately look like is anyone's guess, but what can be discerned is that tools such as sanctions and tariffs are losing potency amid the rise of parallel systems. Nations such as Russia and Iran are fortifying "resistance economies," diversifying trade with BRICS* partners, and evading Western financial dominance through alternatives such as China's CIPS (Cross-Border Interbank Payment System) or Russia's SPFS (System for Transfer of Financial Messages). *(BRICS is an intergovernmental organization comprising 10 countries: Brazil, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Russia, South Africa, and the United Arab Emirates.)

This fragmentation echoes pre-World War II rival blocs, where capitalism splinters into Western rules-based finance versus Eastern state-driven sovereignty.

The United States under President Trump exemplifies this shift through direct interventions that prioritize American interests over United Nations-style consensus. The capture of Venezuelan leader Nicolás Maduro on narco-terrorism charges, followed by U.S. control of Venezuelan oil sales, marks a shift away from globalism to a sovereignty-based approach to foreign policy. As Lexy Reid notes in *Modern Diplomacy*, "since Maduro's capture, Venezuelan oil has been controlled, marketed and sold by the U.S.," bypassing multilateral frameworks and treating resource-rich adversaries as opportunities for enforced access. This realist approach subordinates sovereignty to strategic utility, potentially seeing the United States return to a Teddy Roosevelt "Big Stick" approach to foreign policy — a departure from the liberal order's emphasis on collective security and post-World War II UN arbitration.

U.S. Commerce Secretary Howard Lutnick echoed these themes in a blunt critique at the World Economic Forum in Davos on January 22. He declared that "globalization has failed the West and the U.S.," arguing it erodes domestic industries and worker livelihoods. He positioned the WEF not as a neutral platform but as a

"flagpole" bending to globalist winds, now facing American headwinds through tariffs and alliances that protect U.S. sovereignty. Lutnick highlighted Trump's policies, such as restricting Wall Street's housing market dominance and deploying ICE operations, as models for reclaiming economic control from international entanglements.

The speech sparked controversy. Lutnick was heckled, with Al Gore booing and European Central Bank President Christine Lagarde walking out, underscoring elite resistance to this pivot. Yet Lutnick later quipped that Gore's reaction was the "greatest honor" of his trip, framing it as validation of America's break from failed globalism. He emphasized strong domestic sectors as assets, not flaws, and urged allies to shoulder their security burdens, aligning with Trump's defense strategy shifts.

Lutnick's rhetoric heralds a U.S. foreign policy untethered from UN-centric multilateralism. Post-World War II institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization, designed for collective global prosperity (at the expense of individual national interests), now face erosion as America prioritizes unilateral actions — tariffs on China and Canada, naval posturing against Iran, and resource seizures. For the United States, it's a reclaiming of power; for the world, it's a signal for possible international turbulence as other countries reposition themselves on a shifting geopolitical chessboard. — Rebecca Terrell

U.S. Exits the Paris Climate Accord During a Cold Snap

Oh the irony! In fact, oh the ironies!

On Tuesday, January 27, the United States officially exited the Paris Climate Agreement, a year after President Trump issued his executive order setting the withdrawal in motion. Of course, the United States had never *constitutionally* joined this United Nations accord to begin with, since under the Constitution all treaties must be ratified by the U.S. Senate and no such ratification of the agreement ever took place. The usurpers circumvented this constitutional roadblock to their global designs twice — first under President

BOOK YOUR NEXT SPEAKER!
FREEDOM'S VOICES | JBS.org
JULIANNA ORMOND & RC WILLIAMS
THE GREAT GASLIGHT
ANDREW MULLER
CHRISTIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT
STEVE BONTA
INSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS
JBS
Featured speakers can attend events in-person or digitally through Zoom. For more speakers and updated information, or to schedule, contact JBS Headquarters at 920-749-3780 or go to jbs.org/speakers.

Obama and later under President Biden — by falsely claiming that the agreement was not a treaty, and that the president could therefore unilaterally commit the United States to the agreement without Senate ratification.

Never mind that the supposed non-treaty required the United States to restrict its CO_2 emissions, or that this nonsensical war against the gas of life would do great harm to American productivity. Presumably, the president's signature alone was sufficient to commit the country to such crippling regulations.

Yet the usurpers hold so much sway in Washington that Trump apparently felt it necessary to exit the treaty under its withdrawal provision, as if we were already a party to it, rather than simply declaring U.S. participation in the treaty null and void. And he did so twice.

As if going through the withdrawal process to end U.S. participation in a treaty the Senate had never ratified in the first place was not ironic enough, there was much

THE ONYX COLLECTION
Showers & Lavatories
Custom Made in Kansas, USA Since 1985
800-669-9867 • www.onyxcollection.com
MADE IN THE USA

more irony associated with our exit that should not be overlooked. After all, January 27 was another atypically cold day for much of the country that had already experienced a series of atypically cold days, including a fierce winter storm that dumped plenty of snow and ice on much of the United States. In fact, snow had fallen as far south as Florida, for the second year in a row. The headlines generated by the recent winter storm stood in sharp contrast with other recent news stories warning of the folly of pulling out of the Paris Climate Agreement while the planet is heating up.

Of course, the climate alarmists have explanations for this odd — dare we say embarrassing? — juxtaposition of news stories. One is that there is a difference between weather and climate change. True enough, but it is interesting how that difference is ignored when the weather gets atypically hot. Another rationale is the claim that more global warming also means more extreme weather, including more extreme cold weather. This rationale was recently put forth by a number of establishment publications to explain the recent cold snap. One such example is a *Forbes* article, published on January 27 — the very day the United States got out from under the strictures of the Paris Climate Agreement. It was entitled, "Why Global Warming Can Bring More Heat And More Cold."

But while, in the midst of the big freeze, global alarmists were hyperventilating about the need to curtail CO_2 emissions in order to fight more cooling as well as more warming, yours truly thought of something else entirely. My mind drifted back to some of the many predictions that have been made over the years about catastrophic climate change that turned out to be false. In particular, I recalled what acclaimed movie actor Leonardo DiCaprio said in 2016, when he accepted an Oscar for his performance in *The Revenant*, which was filmed amidst plenty of snow. According to DiCaprio, finding the snow in order to film the movie was not the easiest thing to do. "Our production needed to move to the southern tip of this planet just to be able to find snow," he said. "Climate change is real, it is happening right now, it is the most urgent threat facing our entire species, and we need to work collectively together and stop procrastinating."

Yes, I know, DiCaprio is an actor, not a scientist. Yet, he is trumpeting, albeit rather dramatically and sensationally, a party line that supposedly represents "settled science." In reality, the science was not settled when the "experts" warned in the 1960s and '70s that the world was entering a new ice age. Nor was it settled when "global warming" became the new climate threat. Nor was it settled when the new bugaboo became "climate change," rather than "global warming," to account for both cooling and warming. — Gary Benoit

DOJ Opens Investigation Into the Fed

For the first time in history, a sitting Fed chair faces a DOJ criminal probe. On Friday, January 9, grand jury subpoenas from the Department of Justice landed on the desk of Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell. The documents threaten criminal charges, not for market manipulation or insider trading, but for his congressional testimony on the Fed's $2.5 billion headquarters renovation project. The probe, launched by the U.S. Attorney's Office in D.C., centered on whether Powell's statements to the Senate Banking Committee had been misleading about costs, timelines, or oversight.

Powell appeared unruffled in his Sunday evening statement two days later. "The threat of criminal charges is a consequence of the Federal Reserve setting interest rates based on our best assessment of what will serve the public," he said, framing the investigation as an attack on the central bank's independence. The subpoenas demanded documents, emails, and testimony related to

the renovation — marble upgrades, security retrofits, and budget overruns that had ballooned amid supply-chain chaos.

Critics call it a pretext. Supporters say it's payback for the Fed's post-pandemic rate hikes that cooled inflation but squeezed borrowers. Behind closed doors, the story is more complicated.

The Trump administration has long chafed at the Fed's seeming freedom from accountability (which it framed as "autonomy"). Powell, appointed by Trump in 2017 but reappointed by Biden, had resisted calls to keep rates low during the 2025 recovery. Now, with the DOJ under new leadership, the subpoenas look like a lever to pry open the black box of monetary policy. David Malpass, a former World Bank president, weighed in on CNBC to say, "It's worrisome. You know, the Fed has become now just a giant hedge fund. It's lost a trillion dollars — and counting. It's going to be a gigantic loss. What it does is borrow money at 5.4 percent from banks, and then dumps it into government bonds. So think what that does! That causes the government to think that it's better off than it is. So that encouraged the government to be short when rates were zero."

Was this about marble tiles, or was it a warning shot: the era of the Fed evading checks-and-balances drawing to a close? Republican lawmakers, usually positioning themselves as champions of the rule of law, issued guarded statements defending Fed independence. They raced to frame the situation as the president politicizing disagreements.

Markets barely blinked — stocks dipped fractionally, bonds held steady — but the consequences could have long-term ripples. Foreign investors, who hold trillions of dollars in U.S. debt, might perceive political risk in the world's safest asset if they go by the Fed's spin on events. After all, if the executive branch could weaponize the DOJ against the central bank, what did that mean for the dollar's global status? Politicized rates could mean wilder swings in mortgages, credit cards, and retirement accounts. But if the narrative of the Fed's critics wins out (namely, that the Fed has been behaving in a reckless, deceptive way), then even more damage could be done if international investors understood the true depths of the Federal Reserve's manipulative policies.

Ever the authoritarian, Powell remains defiant. "We will comply with lawful requests," he said, "but we will not compromise the integrity of our decisions." About his color palatte? Hardly. The Federal Reserve, quietly ensconced in power since 1913 (having aggregated to itself prerogatives that had previously been given by the Constitution to Congress), deserves a full audit. Whether the current subpoenas are a first step in that direction remains to be seen. — Rebecca Terrell

Texas and Florida Crack Down on H-1B Use at State Agencies

The two largest Republican-controlled states, Texas and Florida, have announced efforts to crack down on H-1B-visa use at their respective state universities.

On Tuesday, Texas Governor Greg Abbott ordered that state agencies freeze new H-1B visas and report on their prior use of the federally issued visa. *The Texas Tribune* reports:

> Under the directive, public universities and state agencies may not initiate or file new H-1B visa petitions without written permission from the Texas Workforce Commission through the end of the next legislative session on May 31, 2027.
>
> Abbott also ordered agencies and higher education institutions to submit detailed reports to the commission, including the number of new or renewed H-1B visa petitions filed in 2025, the number of H-1B visa holders currently sponsored, job titles, countries of origin and visa expiration dates. He also directed agencies and universities to provide documentation showing they made an effort

> to give qualified Texans a reasonable opportunity to apply for positions filled by H-1B visa holders.
>
> "State government must lead by example and ensure that employment opportunities — particularly those funded with taxpayer dollars — are filled by Texans first," Abbott said.

Meanwhile, Florida is expected to ban its public universities from using H-1B visas to hire faculty. This week, the Florida Board of Governors, which oversees the public-university system, is voting on a proposal that Governor Ron DeSantis ordered late last year.

The *Orlando Sentinel* reports:

> The board is to vote on a proposed one-year ban on hiring faculty who would use the H-1B visa to work in the United States. If approved, the proposed new rule would be put out for two weeks of public comment and then the board could finalize it at a later meeting.
>
> The ban would apply only to new hires, and does not affect H-1B visa holders already working at state universities.

These actions demonstrate that states play a key role in stopping mass migration — both legal and illegal — and much of that role simply involves preventing migrants from accessing government benefits, programs, or (as in these instances) employment.

Despite Texas' and Florida's actions, these states — and the remaining 48 states — can and must do much more to counter mass migration, including by reasserting their sovereign authority over immigration, as Texas tepidly (and partially) did in 2024. States should not place their trust in the federal government for a secure border and pro-American immigration policy. They themselves must act. — Peter Rykowski

Military Purges in China Reveal Deeper Possible Intrigue

Recent social media reports have amplified claims of a thwarted coup against Chinese President Xi Jinping, linked to sweeping purges in the People's Liberation Army (PLA). Charged accusations began when Bloomberg reported on an investigation into General Zhang Youxia, vice chairman of the Central Military Commission (CMC) and a close Xi ally, for alleged leaks of nuclear weapons data to the United States, bribery, and factionalism.

The internet, meanwhile, is abuzz with rumors that Xi received intelligence just two hours before the plot unfolded, leading to the removal of multiple senior CMC commissioners — the largest purge in Chinese Communist Party (CCP) history, exceeding Mao-era actions. Speculation includes possible foreign intelligence agency involvement amid escalating tensions between China and nervous Western powers worried about the Belt and Road Initiative cutting into their naval trade route revenues.

Adam Kobeissi, of the Kobeissi Letter, outlined an extensive shakeup: One CMC vice chairman (Zhang) accused of nuclear leaks, another ousted in October 2025 for corruption, former Defense Minister Li Shangfu removed in 2023, the CMC Joint Staff chief under probe,

and the Political Work Department director dismissed in 2025. These moves reflect Xi's multi-year anti-corruption campaign targeting PLA procurement scandals and perceived disloyalty, leaving the CMC effectively under Xi's direct control with minimal deputies ahead of key party events.

Official Chinese announcements confirm disciplinary probes into Zhang and other generals for "grave violations of discipline and the law," but Beijing has not acknowledged any overthrow plot. Many analysts interpret the actions as power consolidation, reducing factional risks and addressing corruption that could undermine military modernization.

Proponents of the coup theory, however, cite wider geopolitical realities, such as foreign efforts to fragment China, as detailed by Sri Lankan journalist Nuri Vittachi. He cites unearthed documents from a university conference claiming MI-6 (Military Intelligence, Section 6, the foreign intelligence service of the United Kingdom) consulted academic Gerald Segal in the early 1990s to create a map splitting China into three smaller countries, leveraging Uyghur separatists in Xinjiang, Tibetan issues, and potential Central Asian divisions. The documents allege coordination with groups such as the Grey Wolves, training of militants (linked to CIA-backed programs that reportedly contributed to later jihadist networks), support for figures promoting "East Turkestan," and narrative campaigns reframing regional security responses as oppression. The account portrays Xinjiang violence (2007-2014 attacks killing hundreds) as Western-instigated, with ongoing "narrative control" efforts. China has long accused Western intelligence of fomenting separatism.

To understand why China is leveling these accusations, it might be necessary to begin by noting that for more than a century under *Pax Britannica*, the British Royal Navy commanded key global sea lanes, protecting and profiting from maritime trade through strategic bases such as Singapore, Gibraltar, and Suez. After World War II, U.S. naval supremacy under *Pax Americana* secured more than 80 percent of world trade via oceangoing routes, enforcing stability through alliances and chokepoint control.

China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), launched in 2013, undercuts this by developing overland corridors — rail, pipelines, and roads across Central Asia, Myanmar, and Pakistan — that bypass vulnerable maritime bottlenecks such as the Strait of Malacca (through which some 80 percent of China's oil passes) and the Suez Canal. Projects such as Gwadar Port and Eurasian rail networks offer alternatives, reducing reliance on Western-patrolled seas.

The City of London, a historic hub for shipping finance, marine insurance (Lloyd's of London), and trade clearing, stands to lose influence. China's Belt and Road Initiative promotes yuan-denominated financing, alternative networks such as CIPS (the Cross-Border Interbank Payment System), and Chinese-led infrastructure that could sideline London's intermediary role, eroding Anglo-American financial leverage amid shifting trade flows.

So were current events in China instigated by British MI-6? Or was it merely a situation of Xi consolidating power in Beijing ahead of seeking his fourth term as General Secretary in 2027?

Without official confirmation from either the Chinese government (whose advisors would counsel a need to tamp down on information to maintain stability) or from Western intelligence agencies (who see it as in their interest to preserve a guarded silence), events will likely continue to remain in their current murky state. — Rebecca Terrell

State Department Defunds Foreign Groups That Promote DEI, Transgenderism

The U.S. Department of State announced last week that it is expanding the Mexico City Policy, which prohibits foreign aid to groups that promote abortion, to also include groups that promote "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI) and transgenderism.

On January 23, the department announced three rules that will implement this expansion. The rules, titled "Combating Gender Ideology in Foreign Assistance," "Combating Discriminatory Equity Ideology in Foreign Assistance Rules," and "Protecting Life in Foreign Assistance," were published in the *Federal Register* on Tuesday.

Vice President JD Vance celebrated this policy change during his address at the March for Life, stating that "with these additions, the rule will now cover every non-military foreign assistance that America sends. All in all, we have expanded the Mexico City Policy about three times as big as it was before."

The Mexico City Policy, first implemented in 1984 by President Ronald Reagan, has been rescinded and reimplemented repeatedly by succeeding Democratic and Republican administrations. Trump already expanded the rule in 2017 by having the policy apply to all foreign aid rather than just aid intended for "family planning."

Although the State Department's expansion of the Mexico City Policy is a welcome development, we must not forget that all foreign aid is unconstitutional, not being among Congress' enumerated powers in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. Rather than defunding only groups that promote an anti-American, leftist, or globalist agenda, Congress and the president should eliminate all such aid. Call your U.S. representative and senators, and urge them to end foreign aid and restore strict adherence to the Constitution. — Peter Rykowski

The Unwinding Yen Carry Trade: How Cheap Japanese Borrowing Fueled Global Markets — and Now Threatens to Destabilize Them

For decades, the yen carry trade was one of the most lucrative arbitrage plays in global finance. Large banks, hedge funds, and institutional investors borrowed massive sums in Japanese yen at near-zero or negative interest rates, converted the proceeds to U.S. dollars (or other higher-yielding currencies), and invested in assets offering better returns, such as U.S. Treasuries, stocks, corporate bonds, or emerging-market debt. The interest rate differential, combined with a persistently weak yen, allowed them to pocket the spread while funding global liquidity and inflating asset prices worldwide.

This strategy ballooned into hundreds of billions of dollars in positions. Japanese investors held trillions in overseas assets, including over $1 trillion in U.S. Treasuries alone. The trade thrived under the Bank of Japan's (BoJ) ultra-loose policy: negative rates until 2024, aggressive quantitative easing, and yield curve control that suppressed Japanese government bond (JGB) yields and kept borrowing costs negligible.

As of late January 2026, that era is rapidly unwinding. The BoJ held its key short-term policy rate steady at 0.75 percent on January 23, its highest in decades, but signaled readiness for further hikes amid core inflation above two percent. More critically, JGB yields have surged: The 10-year yield reached 2.27 percent on January 27, while 30-year yields climbed to 3.67 percent and 40-year yields exceeded four percent — record levels for longer maturities. This reflects persistent inflation, the BoJ's tapering of bond purchases, fiscal stimulus plans, and weak auction demand.

Higher domestic yields are drawing capital back home. Japanese investors, who once chased foreign returns, now find JGBs attractive again, incentivizing

repatriation. The yen has strengthened sharply, with the USD/JPY rate dropping amid risks of government intervention, and the shrinking interest-rate gap between the two countries. This makes maintaining yen-denominated debt costlier and erodes the carry trade's profitability.

The unwind is accelerating. Investors must sell foreign assets — especially U.S. stocks and bonds — to repay yen loans, buying yen in the process. Analysts warn this could transmit upward pressure on global yields: A modest JGB move can add basis points to U.S. Treasuries, raising borrowing costs for governments, corporations, and households. U.S. stock sell-offs are a key risk, as momentum plays funded by cheap yen come under pressure. Michael Burry and others highlight the potential of "many consequences" for U.S. equities, while broader funding market cracks could spark volatility across currencies, credit, and commodities.

The scale may not be trillions in immediate forced selling — estimates suggest the core yen carry trade around $261 billion — but the interconnectedness amplifies risks. A disorderly unwind could elevate global borrowing costs, stifle growth, and expose a system made fragile by long reliance on Japanese easy money. Japan's normalization experiment reveals the hidden dangers of prolonged low rates: What once greased the wheels of global finance can, when reversed, jam them. Central banks worldwide should brace for the ripple effects. Tokyo's unwind may be the first tremor in a broader rebalancing. — Rebecca Terrell

Glacier National Park's "Gone by the Year 2020" Signs Now Forgotten

On Tuesday, *The Washington Post* reported that "Trump officials have ordered national parks to remove dozens of signs and displays related to climate change, environmental protection and settlers' mistreatment of Native Americans." For example, regarding Glacier National Park and the issue of climate change, the *Post* said, "The administration flagged one brochure for removal or changes that shows images of glaciers retreating and explains that human-caused climate change is a factor in their likely future disappearance." The same day, The Daily Beast covered the story in a more sensationalistic way in an article headlined, "Trump Censors Slammed for Major Changes at National Parks."

Neither of these stories mentioned that signs warning against climate change had already been removed from the park, years before the Trump administration's recent orders. But the media did report that story six years ago, when it was unfolding. For example, on January 8, 2020, CNN reported that "the signs at Glacier National warning that its signature glaciers would be gone by 2020 are being changed" and that "the most prominent placards, at St. Mary Visitor Center, were changed last year [2019]." One of those prominent signs said, "The small alpine glaciers present today started forming about 7,000 years ago and reached their maximum in size and number around 1850, at the end of the Little Ice Age. They are now rapidly shrinking due to human-caused climate change. Computer models indicate the glaciers will all be gone by the year 2020."

So the signs that predicted that the park's glaciers "will all be gone by the year 2020" are gone, and they were replaced by new signs that warned, "When they will completely disappear depends on how and when we act." Another failed predication! Yet this and numerous other examples of false predictions of catastrophic climate change are rarely if ever mentioned in establishment news sources. They've effectively disappeared down an Orwellian memory hole. Dare we say that this history of inaccurate climate change reporting has been censored?

Interestingly, the *Post* interviewed former Glacier National Park superintendent Jeff Mow, who retired in 2022, for its story quoted above. "We're whitewashing or we're taking out all those sort of not-so-nice stories that have occurred in our nation's history," the *Post* quoted Mow saying about the Trump administration's recent orders to remove signs and displays at national parks. Mow surely must have known about the "gone by the year 2020" signs that were removed from Glacier National Park around 2020. But if he told the *Post* reporter about those signs, it did not find its way into the article. — Gary Benoit

HUD Citizenship Verification Ends Taxpayer Giveaway to Illegals

On January 23, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released a statement notifying public housing authorities (PHAs) and owners in HUD-funded housing programs that they have 30 days to verify the citizenship and immigration status for all tenants using the new Enterprise Income Verification-Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (EIV-SAVE) Tenant Match Report.

PHAs must use the EIV-SAVE report to confirm tenant eligibility and initiate any necessary corrective actions. Those who fail to do so may be subject to sanctions, funding recapture, and any other corrective action that HUD deems necessary. This order is based on Section 214 of the 1980 Housing and Community Development Act and President Donald Trump's Executive Order 14218.

This order follows a HUD and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) joint audit exposing rampant government benefits fraud. HUD announced nearly 200,000 tenants are flagged for eligibility verification, with 25,000 deceased tenants still "occupying" housing units, and 6,000 ineligible noncitizens illegally receiving benefits. HUD Secretary Scott Turner stated:

> We are proud to collaborate with DHS to execute on the President's agenda of rooting out abuse of taxpayer funded resources. Ineligible non-citizens have no place to receive welfare benefits. With this new directive and audit, HUD is putting new processes in place to safeguard taxpayer resources and put the American people first.

Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing Ben Hobbs added that this step prioritizes American families on waitlists, stating:

> Today's action to verify the immigration eligibility of all HUD-assisted households is a major step forward to ensure we put American families first and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse…. There are hundreds of thousands of American families on housing waitlists across the country. It is essential we prioritize our limited resources to eligible families only.

For decades, globalists have undermined U.S. sovereignty through mass migration and the welfare state, transferring billions of dollars in wealth from Americans to subsidize the illegal-migrant invasion. These noncitizen criminals who disregarded the laws of our nation have been rewarded with housing, food, healthcare, education, and U.S. citizenship for their children.

Although this long-overdue measure could save billions, it's not nearly enough — states must nullify unconstitutional spending and rein in the federal government. Expanding audits across every welfare program to dismantle the globalist welfare magnet for illegal migrants is a crucial first step.

Congress must go further and eliminate unconstitutional socialist entitlement programs — Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Housing programs, SNAP, etc. — entirely, and ultimately abolish their agencies, including the Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Agriculture, and the Social Security Administration.

These issues are the downstream effects of an out-of-control government bloated by socialist welfare schemes and open-border policies. The first, second, and third-order consequences of these disastrous policies have proven catastrophic for our nation. — D. Michael DeRidder

Government Giveth Cheap Gas, but Taketh Away Freedom: the Kill Switch Irony

In recent weeks, the Trump administration has celebrated a significant economic win for American families: plummeting gasoline prices that promise real relief at the pump. According to White House announcements, motorists are on track to spend $11 billion less on gas in 2026 compared to the previous year, with national averages projected for the cost of gasoline to hover around $2.97 per gallon — the lowest since the Covid era.

This drop has been touted as a direct result of energy independence policies, deregulation, and a focus on domestic production. In 43 states, regular unleaded is now under $3 per gallon, putting more money back into pockets and encouraging greater mobility for work, family travel, and commerce.

The message from the administration is clear: Lower energy costs promote freedom of movement, reduce inflation pressures, and strengthen the American way of life. Paired with falling mortgage rates, these developments are framed as tangible victories in the fight against economic hardship.

Yet, in a striking contradiction, Congress has quietly preserved a mechanism that could severely restrict that very mobility. In a recent vote on this year's Consolidated Appropriations Act, an amendment offered by Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) to repeal the Biden-era mandate for "kill switch" technology in new vehicles was defeated. Fifty-seven House Republicans joined Democrats to keep the requirement intact.

The mandate, stemming from National Highway Traffic Safety Administration rules, requires advanced impaired driving prevention systems in vehicles starting with model year 2026 or 2027. These systems include passive monitoring of driver behavior and the capability to disable the vehicle if impairment is detected — without warrant, due process, or appeal. Critics, including Massie, argue this amounts to a government-installed "kill switch" that threatens privacy, property rights, and the freedom to travel.

The irony is stark. On one hand, Washington cheers policies that make driving more affordable and accessible, ostensibly to empower citizens with greater mobility. On the other, it endorses technology that could remotely or automatically halt a vehicle at the government's discretion — or that of a malfunctioning algorithm. What good is cheaper gas if the state retains the power to immobilize your car?

This duality underscores a deeper concern: the tension between proclaimed economic freedoms and creeping technological controls. Lower fuel costs may ease daily burdens, but they do little to safeguard against overreach that treats personal vehicles as extensions of state authority. The Founders understood mobility as essential to liberty — whether crossing state lines or simply commuting to work. When government simultaneously facilitates and restricts that freedom, it reveals a troubling inconsistency.

Americans should welcome relief at the pump, but we must remain vigilant. True economic and personal freedom requires not just affordable energy, but protection from mandates that erode constitutionally protected rights. The kill switch vote serves as a reminder: Gains in one area can mask losses in another. Vigilance, not complacency, is the price of preserving the open road. — Rebecca Terrell

NYMHM: News You May Have Missed

U.S. Seeks to Implement UN Security Council Resolutions on Iran

Pentagon Plans Major Weapons-production Boost to Maintain the American Empire

"You Can't Have Guns": Trump Deepens Second Amendment Rift After Minneapolis Shooting

Va. University Fires Nurse Who Solicited Injecting ICE Agents With Paralytic Drug — Doc Says It's Attempted Murder

U.K. Nurse Reinstated After Suspension for Misgendering Patient

CNN Source: Pretti Clashed With Agents the Week Before He Was Fatally Shot

Despite Trump, WEF-Davos Still Pushing World Order

Former CIA Analyst Larry Johnson on Trump's Interventionism in Iran, Venezuela, and Greenland

Report: China's American-citizen James Bond Villain Tycoon Is Funding Anti-ICE Agitation

Does Science Belong to God or Caesar? Top Scientist Slams Climate Alarmism

[END]